

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 9, 2007. In the Office Action, claims 1-20 were pending and were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 17 and 19 have been amended and claim 20 has been cancelled. Further, new claim 21 has been added. Additionally, portions of the specification have been amended. In view of the following, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

On page 2, the Office Action objected to the disclosure because of a number of typographical errors. Herewith, Applicant has amended the specification to correct these identified errors. In particular, "suitable buss" on page 3, line 14 has been corrected to "suitable bus", "an customer" on page 4, line 1 has been corrected to "a customer", and "a Internet" on page 4, line 2 has been corrected to "an Internet." Further, "twelve rows are show" on page 14, lines 15-16 has been corrected to "twelve rows are shown", reference numeral "408" on page 15, line 26 has been corrected to "508", and "supposed to sown a ComboBox" on page 21, line 26 has been corrected to "supposed to show a ComboBox."

Applicant submits that the typographical errors identified on page 2 of the Office Action have been corrected and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Also on page 2, the Office Action objected to claim 16 as it was asserted that "jpeg" is not disclosed in the specification. The Examiner indicated that this term would be construed to mean a "computer-readable image format." In the spirit of furthering prosecution, Applicant has herewith amended "a jpeg representation" in claim 16 to recite "a computer-readable image format representation" and submits that claim 16, as amended, does not contain informalities.

On page 3, claims 1-3, 9, and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nelson et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0174085, hereinafter "Nelson"). Of these, claims 1, 17 and 19 are independent.

Independent claim 1, as amended, provides a method for selectively loading controls comprising "displaying a graphical representation of a first user interface component having a visual appearance of a mechanism for facilitating an input of text." Claim 1 further recites

"receiving a first selection input that corresponds to the graphical representation" and "loading a first control in response to the first selection input, the first control being associated with the graphical representation and configured to facilitate an incorporation of text into the graphical representation." Applicant submits that the amendments to claim 1 provided herewith are clearly supported in the specification, in one instance, in paragraphs [0041]-[0043].

Nelson discloses an Internet presentation system that enables users to access and edit presentation files on an Internet-accessible server. The cited section of Nelson (paragraph [0058]) states that the slides from the presentation editor are viewable in three formats. A "slide view" allows the user to view and edit individual slides and a "slideshow view" launches a presentation of the slides in a presentation player. Further, a "thumbnail view" lets the user preview thumbnails of all the slides. While the "thumbnail" preview of Nelson allows users to select and view individual slides, the thumbnails do not "hav[e] the appearance of a mechanism for facilitating an input of text." Further, selecting a thumbnail terminates the "thumbnail view" and loads the corresponding slide in the "slide view." Selecting a slide does not load a first control that is "configured to facilitate an incorporation of text into the graphical representation" as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is neither taught nor suggest by Nelson and is in allowable form. Further, it is submitted that dependent claims 2, 3, 9 and 14-16 are also in allowable form at least based on their relation to claim 1. Additionally, it is believed that at least some of these dependent claims recite additional features that are neither taught nor suggested by Nelson. For example, dependent claim 2 recites "receiving a second selection input that corresponds to the graphical representation of the second user interface component" and "terminating said first control in response to the second selection input." Further, a second control is loaded in response to the first selection input, the second control being configured to facilitate an incorporation of text in the graphical representation of the second user interface component. As discussed above, Nelson does not teach or suggest a graphical representation having a visual appearance of a mechanism for facilitating the input of text or a control configured to facilitate an incorporation of text into the graphical representation. Further, Nelson also does not teach or suggest terminating a first control and loading a second control in

response to the second selection input. In paragraph [0058], Nelson discloses user selection of thumbnails to load images of the individual slides. When a user selects a thumbnail, the thumbnail view is terminated and the corresponding slide is loaded to the presentation editor. In this manner, the thumbnails are no longer provided to the user. Thus, the system of Nelson does not teach or suggest a second input selection corresponding to a graphical representation of a second user interface component where the second input terminates a first control and loads a second control.

Dependent claim 14 recites “providing a graphical representation of an Internet browser.” The Office Action cites paragraph [0012] of Nelson as disclosing this feature. However, the cited section of Nelson discloses that the system enables presentation files to be created and accessed using a standard web browser. There is no teaching or suggestion in Nelson for providing a graphical representation of an Internet browser interface where the graphical representation includes the first user interface component having a visual appearance of a mechanism for facilitating an input of text.

It is noted that these are only examples of some dependent claims that are believed to be independently patentable.

Independent claim 17, as amended, recites “providing a graphical representation of a user interface that contains a plurality of graphical representations of individual user interface components, each graphical representation of an individual user interface component being associated with a control”, “receiving a user input”, and “identifying one of the graphical representations...as being associated with the user input.” Further, claim 17 recites “loading a first control, the first control being associated with said one of the graphical representations”, “receiving a second user input”, and identifying one of the graphical representations...associated with the second user input.” The first control is terminated and a second control is loaded in response to the second user input. The second control is associated with one of the graphical representations associated with the second user input.

As discussed above, Nelson does not teach or suggest terminating a first control and loading a second control in response to a second input. In paragraph [0058], Nelson discloses user selection of thumbnails to load images of the individual slides. When a user selects a

thumbnail, the thumbnail view is terminated and the corresponding slide is loaded to the presentation editor. In this manner, the thumbnails are no longer provided to the user. The system of Nelson does not provide a second user input corresponding to a second graphical representation where the second input terminates a first control and loads a second control. For at least this reason, it is submitted that claim 17 is neither taught nor suggested by Nelson and is allowable form. Further, it is submitted that claim 18 is allowable at least based on its relation to claim 17.

Claim 19, as amended, provides a user interface including "a plurality of graphical representations of user interface components." As claimed, at least one graphical representation has a visual appearance of a mechanism for facilitating an input of text. Further, each of the plurality of graphical representations is claimed as being associated with a control, and each control is configured to be loaded exclusively and not concurrently with another control that has not been terminated.

Nelson discloses a website for accessing and editing presentation slides. A user selects an individual slide from a plurality of thumbnails to view the slide corresponding to the thumbnail. The individual slide is displayed in the "slide view" and the "thumbnail view is terminated." Nelson does not teach or suggest a plurality of graphical representations of user interface components, wherein at least one graphical representation has a visual appearance of a mechanism for facilitating an input of text. As discussed above, the thumbnails of Nelson do not have a visual appearance of a mechanism for facilitating an input of text.

Further, it is submitted that Nelson also does not teach or suggest loading a control exclusively and not concurrently with another control that has not been terminated. In the rejection of claim 20 on page 6, the Office Action cites paragraph [0058] as disclosing this feature. However, it is submitted that loading the individual slides in response to selection of a thumbnail does not teach or suggest loading a control exclusively and not concurrently. Each slide is a graphic representation incorporating text and other components and may include a plurality of controls such as text boxes, list boxes, etc. However, Nelson simply does not teach or suggest loading these controls exclusively or not concurrently as claimed. For at least these

reasons, it is submitted that claim 19 is neither taught nor suggested by Nelson and is in allowable form.

On page 6, claims 4-8 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Ikemota (U.S. Patent No. 5,969,717). It is submitted that these claims are allowable at least based on their relation to claim 1, discussed above. Additionally, it is believed that at least some of these claims contain features that are also neither taught nor suggest by the cited references. For example, dependent claim 4 recites "receiving a data input that corresponds to said first control" and "rendering a representation of the data input as part of the graphical representation of the first user interface component." Further, claim 5 depends from claim 4 and recites "wherein said rendering occurs prior to said terminating." These are examples of some dependent claims that are believed to be independently patentable.

New claim 21 depends from claim 17. It is submitted that claim 21 is allowable at least based on its relation to claim 17, discussed above.

In conclusion, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely claims 1-19 and 21 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By:



Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:cjv:rdg